

ICS Reg.

The Director of Central Intelligence

Washington, D.C. 20505

Intelligence Community Staff

DCI/ICS 84-4041  
23 August 1984

24 AUG 1984

LOGGED

MEMORANDUM FOR: State Department  
INR/OIS  
Mrs. Eileen Vanderburgh

STAT FROM:

[REDACTED]  
ICS/IHCSUBJECT: Review of INR Information Handling Study  
Phase 1, Requirements AnalysisGENERAL COMMENTS

1. ICS reviewed the INR Requirements Document developed by Planning Research Corporation and found the document to be well written and logically presented. The accuracy of the contents, to include the organizational responsibilities of INR, can best be assessed by DOS/INR and is therefore not addressed by this review. The entire document reflects extensive effort by PRC to both understand the complexity of the functional problems and the unique State environment.
2. There is, however, a notable absence of performance requirements in this requirements analysis. System functional requirements are clearly delineated but no references could be found to system performance. Analysts should be asked what constitutes acceptable system responses and performance. Satisfaction of both functional and performance requirements are key to system acceptance and success. The incorporation of performance requirements is recommended.
3. Clearly the development of a new INR/ADP system will not satisfy all the requirements mentioned. Some are not ADP oriented. How does INR intend to ensure that non ADP requirements are accomplished? A reference to how this is to be addressed is recommended.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. Page E-3: Change 'identified' to 'identified'.
2. Page 2-9, Section 2.4.1: Change 'his' to 'this'.
3. Page 2-14, Figure 2.6: If the incorporation of room numbers is to emphasize that offices and divisions are widely distributed then that point should be made on Page 2-13, where the figure is introduced. Otherwise, the incorporation of room numbers seems unnecessary and appears to add nothing. Recommend deletion.
4. Page 3-2, Section 3.2.1: Why didn't all personnel interviewed provide time estimates instead of just 35? This statement leaves the reader wondering why the sample of 35 was chosen. Recommend that this be answered.
5. Page 3-4, Section 3.2.2: It doesn't appear that reference to a PRC AF study adds anything to a discussion of the State department unless the two environments are very similar. Recommend deletion.

6. Page 3-10: Reference is made to sectional messages arriving separately. Why is this functional problem not mentioned as a requirement, i.e. assembly and distribution of sectional messages, in Section 4.4.3.2 or elsewhere in Section 4? Recommend its incorporation if it is a valid analyst requirement.
7. Page 3-11: Prioritization of message traffic is addressed here. Why is there no reference to a requirement for automated prioritization and dissemination of message traffic under Section 4.4.3? Recommend its incorporation.
8. Page 3-14: Change 'orperated' to 'operated'.
9. Page 3-14: Computer reliability is addressed here. Why isn't computer reliability, e.g. system must be up 99% of the time, mentioned as a requirement in Section 4? Recommend its inclusion.
10. Page 3-23: The lack of trained indexers and job turnover is mentioned here. Will the ADP solution mentioned on Page 4-15 totally solve this problem or is it a resource problem? If it is a resource problem, recommend the requirement for personnel be reflected somewhere in this document.
11. Page 3-30: Non standard INR files are mentioned here and also the lack of policy for purging files. They don't however appear to be reflected in a requirements statement. If correction of these problems is a requirement, recommend their incorporation in Section 4.
12. Page 4-12: This section on security is vague. Current DCID does not recognize multi level secure systems. Given the expense and difficulty of achieving multi level security, it seems equally important to outline near term security goals, e.g. the requirement for a system security plan, etc. Recommend expansion of this section with more detail.
13. Page 4-12/13, Section 4.4.2.3: This section has a 'Background' but not an 'Objective'.
14. Page 4-14: Discussion here relates to information specialists. Does this represent an augmentation in the INR staff? If so, it's a resource requirement and should be addressed as such.
15. Page 4-17: Profiles are discussed here. Is on-line profile generation or near real time profile updates a requirement? If so, this should be mentioned here.
16. Page 4-19: The Community Information Retrieval System (CIRS) should be included in this list.
17. Page 4-21: Analyst to Analyst communication requirements emphasize data transfer. Is there no requirement for conversational analyst to analyst communications? If there is a requirement other than phones, it should be mentioned.

These comments are submitted by the IC Staff for your consideration and for incorporation in the requirements analysis document where INR deems it appropriate.

STAT

SUBJECT: Review of INR Information Handling Study  
Phase 1, Requirements Analysis

Distribution:

Orig - Adse

1 - IHC Subject(NMA)

1 - IHC Chrono

1 - ICS Registry

STAT

ICS/IHC

(23 Aug 84)